



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,741	06/04/2001	Kristen L. Bhatti	10008151-1	4871

7590 04/15/2008
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/873,741
Filing Date: June 04, 2001
Appellant(s): BHATTI ET AL.

Peter Kraguljac
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed January 16, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed August 23, 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,625,643	COLBY	09-2003
6,615,240	SULLIVAN	09-2003

6,859,829

PARUPUDI

02-2005

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 35 l(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Colby et al.

(USPN 6,625,643- Date of Patent: September 23, 2003, herein referred to as

"Colby").

3. As to claim 1, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for selectively providing technical support documents from a web server having access to the requested technical support documents to a peripheral device that has printer, scanner and/or fax functionality via the Internet, the peripheral device being of the type which is capable of executing activated operating events and having an associated web client with a stored default URL for accessing the web server, the method comprising the steps of: activating an event on the

device (see col.29, lines 7- 43); requesting the default uniform resource locator with the activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43) and returning to the device one or more of the technical support documents (see col.4, lines 5-22) that relate to the activated event of the requested uniform resource locator (see col.29, lines 7-43, col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col. 12, lines 6-60).

4.As to claim 2, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: reading device configurations from the web client; determining whether to print or display the returned technical support document from the device configuration; printing the returned one or more technical support document (see col.5, lines 5-22) when the device configuration indicates print (See col. 16, lines 35-53); and, displaying the returned technical support document when the device configuration indicates display (see col.20, lines 40-55).

5. As to claim 6, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein, prior to said step of requesting a default uniform resource locator with the activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43), further comprising the step of obtaining a default uniform resource locator from the web client (see col.8, lines 37-67).

6.As to claim 7, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a method comprising: in response to receiving a help command, identifying an event which has occurred on a peripheral device where the event has product an error (seecol.24, lines 1-5) (Colby teaches clicking on the event name will produce a report used by event); using a default uniform resource locator to transmit a request to a web server (see col.8, lines 36-53, Colby teaches create a default page for the event); and where the request causes the web server to return one or more technical support documents

which relate to the error (see col.29, lines 7-21) (Colby teaches if the response message is received matching the Event ID).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.Claims 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby et al., (hereinafter Colby) U.S. Patent No. 6,625,643 in view of Sullivan et al., (hereinafter Sullivan) U.S. Patent No. 6,615,240.

9. As to claim 3, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for selectively providing technical support documents from a web server having access to the requested technical support documents to a peripheral device that has printer, scanner and/or fax functionality via the Internet, the peripheral device being of the type which is capable of executing activated operating events and having an associated web client with a stored default URL for accessing the web server, the method comprising the steps of: activating an event on the device (see col.29, lines 7- 43); requesting the default uniform resource locator with the activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43); and returning to the device one or more of the technical support

documents that relate to the activated event of the requested uniform resource locator (see col.29, lines 7-43, col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.12, lines 6-60), wherein said step of requesting the default uniform resource locator further comprising the steps of: reading a device state table of the peripheral device; obtaining a most recently activated event from the device state table; and determining whether the most recently activated (see col.29, lines 7-21). But Colby does not explicitly teach produced an error.

10. In the same field of endeavor, Sullivan discloses (e.g., Technical support chain automation with guided self-help capability and option to escalate to live help). Sullivan discloses produced an error (see Sullivan col.7, lines 44-51)(he or she received an error message, the display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support).

11. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Sullivan's teachings of technical support chain automation with guided self-help capability and option to escalate to live help with the teachings of Colby to have a producing an error, for the purpose of simplify the support process in the situation where the self-help has not succeeded satisfactorily and escalation to a support center is necessary [see col.2, lines 38-40].

12. As to claim 4, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said step of determining whether the most recently activated event is an error further comprising the steps of: selecting the most recently activated event when the most recently activated event and requesting the default uniform resource locator without an

Art Unit: 2100

activated event when the most recently activated event did not device (see col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.12, lines 6-60). But Colby does not explicitly teach produced an error. But Colby does not explicitly teach produced an error.

13. In the same field of endeavor, Sullivan discloses (e.g., Technical support chain automation with guided self-help capability and option to escalate to live help). Sullivan discloses produced an error (see Sullivan col.7, lines 44-51)(he or she received an error message, the display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support).

14. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Sullivan's teachings of Technical support chain automation with guided self-help capability and option to escalate to live help with the teachings of Colby to have a producing an error, for the purpose of simplify the support process in the situation where the self-help has not succeeded satisfactorily and escalation to a support center is necessary [see col.2, lines 38-40].

15. As to claim 5, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said step of obtaining a default uniform resource locator further comprising the steps of: returning a help menu for activating an event (see col.29, lines 7-43); displaying the help menu to the user; choosing an event from the help menu by the user and selecting the chosen event from the help menu as the selected event (see col.32, lines 45-67).

16. Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby et al., (hereinafter Colby) U.S. Patent No. 6,625,643 of Sullivan et al., (hereinafter

Sullivan) U.S. Patent No. 6,615,240 further in view Parupudi et al., (hereinafter Parupudi) U.S. Patent No. 6, 859,829.

17.As to claim 8, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes embodied in the medium that when executed causes a computer to: obtain a most recently activated event from a device state table in a peripheral device computer (col.6, lines 16-56, and col.29, lines 8-43); request a default uniform resource locator for a server having technical support documents relating to the most recently activated event and return one or more technical support documents (see col.4, lines 5-22) relating to the most recently activated event to the device (see col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, col.12, lines 6-60, and col.29, lines 8-43). But Colby and Sullivan do not explicitly teach a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality. However, Parupudi teaches a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality (see Fig. 1, and col.4, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Purupudi into the computer system of Colby to have a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions which is not wasting of consumes resources.

18.As to claim 9, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program

codes embodied in the medium that when executed causes a computer to: select an event on a peripheral device where the event has produced an error message (see col.24, lines 1-5) (Colby teaches clicking on the event name will produce a report used by event); obtain a default uniform resource locator from firmware of the peripheral device (col.6, lines 16-56); request the default uniform resource locator to transmit to a remote computer a request that identifies at least one or the selected event and the error message (see col.29, lines 7-21) (Colby teaches if the response message is received matching the Event ID); and return to the peripheral device one or more technical support documents (see col.4, lines 5-22) error message (see col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.20, lines 5-65). But Colby and Sullivan do not explicitly teach a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality.

However, Parupudi teaches a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality (see Fig. 1, and col.4, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Purupudi into the computer system of Colby to have a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions which is not wasting of consumes resources.

19.As to claim 10, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for providing technical support documents to a peripheral device via the Internet, comprising: a periplaeral device having a web client for requesting a relevant ' technical support document of an activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43) the

peripheral device being configured to request, in response to an error event, a relevant technical support document from a web server using a default uniform resource locator (see col.8, lines 36-53, Colby teaches create a default page for the event); and a web server for responding to the request by returning the relevant technical support document relating to the error events (see col.29, lines 7-21) (Colby teaches checking for response messages in the event message if matching the Event ID, the user will received notification event)(see col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, col. 12, lines 6-60, and col.20, lines 5-65). But Colby and Sullivan do not explicitly teach a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality. However, Parupudi teaches a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality (see Fig. 1, and col.4, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Purupudi into the computer system of Colby to have a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions which is not wasting of consumes resources.

20. As to claim 11, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising a dedicated switch on the peripheral device for users to request technical support documents (see fig. 1 peripheral device). 23. As to claim 12, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said dedicated switch is a push button located on the peripheral device (see col.32, lines 45-67).

21. As to claim 13, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said dedicated switch is an icon that is displayed on the control panel of the peripheral device (see col.20, lines 45-50). 25.

22.As to claim 14, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said peripheral device further

comprising a device state table for storing a log of events of the device, wherein the most recently activated event from the device state table is the activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43); when the peripheral device makes a technical support document request (see col.29, lines 7-28).

23.As to claim 15, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the activated event is appended to the request for the default uniform resource locator (see col.8, lines 40-67).

(10) Response to Argument

--Appellant argues that Colby does not teach “returning to the device one or more of the technical support documents that relate to the activated event of the requested uniform resource locator”.

--Examiner respectfully disagrees. Colby teaches returning to the device one or more of the technical support documents that relate to the activated event of the requested uniform resource locator as shown in col.8, lines 37-67, and col.29, lines 7-21) (Colby teaches if the response message is received matching the Event ID).

--Appellant argues that Colby does not teach “receiving a help command, identifying an event which has occurred on a peripheral device where the event has produced an error”.

--Examiner respectfully disagrees. Colby teaches receiving a help command, identifying an event which has occurred on a peripheral device where the event has produced an error as shown in ol.24, lines 1-5) (Colby teaches clicking on the event name will produce a report used by event).

--Appellant argues that Colby does not teach “relating to causing a web server to return one or more technical support documents”.

--Examiner respectfully disagrees. Colby teaches relating to causing a web server to return one or more technical support documents which relate to an error as shown in col.4, lines 5-22.

Appellant argues that Sullivan does not teach “determining whether the most recently activated event produced an error”.

--Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sullivan teaches determining whether the most recently activated event produced an error as shown in Sullivan discloses produced an error col.7, lines 44-51(*he or she received an error message, the display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support*).

--Appellant argues that Colby does not teach “select an event on a peripheral device where the event has produced an error message”.

--Examiner respectfully disagrees. Colby teaches select an event on a peripheral device where the event has produced an error message as shown in col.29, lines 7-43, and col.8, lines 37-67.

--Appellant argues that Colby does not teach “a peripheral device being configured to request, in response to an error event, a relevant technical support document from a web server using a default uniform resource locator”.

--Examiner respectfully disagrees. Colby teaches a peripheral device being configured to request, in response to an error event, a relevant technical support document from a web server using a default uniform resource locator as shown in col.29, lines 7-43, col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.12, lines 6-60).

--Appellant argues that Colby does not teach “obtain a most recently activated event from a device state table in a peripheral device”.

Art Unit: 2100

--Examiner respectfully disagrees. Colby teaches obtain a most recently activated event from a device state table in a peripheral device as shown in col.5, line 59 to col. 6, line 5, and col. 7, lines 20-30.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/T. N./

Thanh Tammy nguyen

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

Conferees:

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151